REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. The above listing of the claims supersedes any previous listing. Favorable reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Amendments/Status

In this response, claims 2-3 and 19-20 have been cancelled, and independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended in a manner which is deemed to clarify the subject matter for which patent protection is sought. Support for the amendments is found in the specification/drawings taken as a whole.

Claims 1 and 4-18 remain pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Felix Urbanczyk (US Patent 4755802) in view of Budrick S. Caraba (US Patent 5022340) is respectfully traversed.

In this response independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to further clarify the present invention over the cited prior art. In particular, these claims have been amended to specify that the *"at least one of said elements includes a bell having a clapper or ball for providing an alert indication directed to the user **only** when the element is **being** moved"*.

As will be appreciated, the claimed subject matter is such that it does not have its own power source. That is, the claimed arrangement does not have its own electrical or mechanical power source and relies solely on manually induced movement of the fastener equipment, caused by the item being carried for example, to cause movement of the clapper or ball. As such, the alert indication only sounds when (a) the element is being moved; and (b) the alert indication is not being suppressed by the first and second elements being at or adjacent one another.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner advances that Urbanczyk (US 4,755,802) discloses the alarm being triggered when the zipper is opened and the alarm being deactivated when the zipper is closed. However, Urbanczyk operates using its own electrical power source (batteries 28 and 29) and, once activated, sounds until the alarm is deactivated, irrespective of

whether the bag to which the zipper is attached is moved or not. Accordingly, the alarm of Urbanczyk does not provide an alert indication directed to the user only when the element is being moved, as in the claimed invention.

Further, the embodiment of Urbanczyk is such that the zipper can moved by a predetermined amount before the alarm is triggered. Note that it is necessary to be able to open the zipper a predermined amount (see Fig. 1 of Urbanczyk) to allow the user to reach in an deactivate the alarm under normal usage. Fully closing the zipper resets the alarm.

With regard to Caraba (US 5,022,340), this discloses bell 13 and 14 rung by a clapper 18 when a door is opened. However, Caraba requires a means of mechanical power in the form of coil spring 43 which must be firstly wound to provide a rotary drive to the clapper 18 (see col. 5, lines 4-31). When the door is opened, the energy stored in the coil spring 43 drives the clapper to ring the alarm continually until the mechanical energy stored therein is spent, irrespective of whether the door is subsequently moved. As such, Caraba does not provide an alert indication directed to the user only when the element is being moved, as in the claimed invention.

Furthermore, neither Urbanczyk or Caraba teach or suggest that a burglar alarm is possible without its own power source. Both these documents require their own power source (viz., battery/spring) because they relate solely to anti-crime alarm devices requiring a strong energy to power a loud alarm. This is clearly and fundamentally different in terms of both size and function from the present invention, which does not have its own power source and is intended to produce a simple low volume alert directed to a user when an item is being moved and its fastener equipment is in an unsecured state.

Moreover, it would not be possible to incorporate or attach Caraba's bell to a fastener equipment of Urbanczyk as they utilise totally incompatible power sources. Further, even if this were possible, the resultant device would still have a spring-powered mechanism and hence its own power source which is configured to drive the alarm even when the item is stationary, in contrast to the claimed invention. Indeed, as Urbanczyk or Caraba are both anti-crime devices, there is no suggestion that would be provided without their own power source for fear of insufficient volume for an anti-crime alarm.

Yet furthermore, there would be no motivation to modify Urbanczyk or Caraba so as to produce an alert indication only when the element is being moved as this would be totally contrary to their purpose as anti-crime alarms.

It is therefore submitted that the claimed invention is novel and non-obvious over Urbanczyk and Caraba.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: December 19, 2008
KMB/KT/ser